

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,907	02/28/2004	Ross Cutler	307055.01	.7527
	7590 01/07/2008 CORPORATION		EXAM	-7527 MINER R, TIMOTHY J PAPER NUMBER
C/O LYON &	•	WEIDNER, TIMOTHY J		
300 ESPLANA SUITE 800	DEDRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
OXNARD, CA	93036		2619	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•		14		
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/788,907	CUTLER, ROSS		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Timothy Weidner	2619		
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory provided to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH statute, cause the application to become ABAN	TION. be timely filed S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1		•		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
closed in accordance with the practice unc	del Ex parte Quayle, 1999 O.B. 1	1, 400 0.0. 210.		
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 and 24-30 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 15-22 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 23 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction as	ndrawn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2007 Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	is/are: a) \square accepted or b) \square on the drawing(s) be held in abeyance brrection is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in App priority documents have been re ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National Stage		
Attachment(s)		(770.440)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9483) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	· /	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date mal Patent Application		

10/788,907 Art Unit: 2619

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

- 1. Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 13, 15, and 30 are currently amended.
- 2. Applicant's amendment of the drawings has been entered. Objection to the drawings is hereby withdrawn.
- 3. Applicant's amendment of claim 30 overcomes the rejection under 35 USC 101.
- 4. The double patenting rejection is hereby withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 11/13/2007 with regard to rejection of claims 15-22 and 30 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 15, Applicant argues that Krzyzanowski fails to disclose "establish communications via the common network between the discovering device and the discoverable device." Giving the broadest reasonable interpretation to this claim limitation, establishment of "communications via the common network" is taught by Krzyzanowski in paragraph 72 where a legacy bridge device (discovering device) transmits a unique ID to a mobile controller (discovering device), and the mobile controller transmits the unique ID to a central server over an IP network (common network). Further, as specified in paragraph 64, communications are between the controller and the bridge over the IP network via the server. Therefore, both the original claim limitation and the amended claim limitation are disclosed by Krzyzanowski.

10/788,907 Art Unit: 2619

6. Applicant's arguments, see pages 13-18 and 20-22, filed 11/13/2007, with respect to claims 1-14 and 23-29 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-14 and 23-29 have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 8. Claims 15, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Krzyzanowski et al. (US 2004/0133704 A1, herein "Krzyzanowski").
- 9. Regarding claim 15, Krzyzanowski teaches a computer-implemented process for a discovering electronic device among at least one discoverable electronic devices, each of which is connected to a common network and located in the same delimited space (paragraphs 0035, 0052, 0068), to discover the presence and network address of one or more of said discoverable electronic devices to facilitate the transfer of data and other communications over the common network (paragraph 0072), said process comprising using a computer to perform the following process actions: the discovering device receiving a signal transmitted by a discoverable electronic device (paragraph 0072; "legacy bridge device emits an IR signal to a mobile controller"), wherein the signal comprises data representing the address assigned to the discoverable device on

10/788,907 Art Unit: 2619

the common network (paragraph 0069), and wherein the signal is not transmitted via the common network and is transmitted in a manner that substantially limits its reception to the delimited space (paragraph 0072; "IR signal" is inherently limited to the delimited space because IR does not penetrate walls); and the discovering device using the received network address to establish communications via the common network between the discovering device and the discoverable device that transmitted the address (paragraph 0072; "mobile controller transmits the unique ID ... over an IP network").

- 10. Regarding claim 19, Krzyzanowski teaches each discoverable device comprises an infrared (IR) transmitter and the discovering device comprises an IR receiver (paragraph 0070), and wherein the signal transmitted by a discoverable electronic device is an IR signal emitted from its IR transmitter (paragraph 0072), and wherein the process action of the discovering device receiving a signal transmitted by a discoverable electronic device comprises receiving the signal via its IR receiver (paragraph 0072).
- 11. Regarding claim 20, Krzyzanowski teaches the IR transmitter of each discoverable electronic device is powerful enough to extend throughout the delimited space (paragraph 0052).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

10/788,907 Art Unit: 2619

- 13. Claims 16-18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krzyzanowski et al. (US 2004/0133704 A1, herein "Krzyzanowski") as applied to claim 15 above, in view of Tie et al. (US 2006/0143458 A1, herein "Tie").
- 14. Regarding claim 16, Krzyzanowski teaches the signal transmitted by the discoverable electronic device further comprises a an address expressly indicating the type of electronic device it is (paragraph 0069; MAC address inherently indicates type because MAC addresses always contain a type field, e.g. organization (OUI) or multicast/unicast bit), and inherently indicating its presence in the delimited space and being accessible via said common network (paragraphs 0035, 0052, 0068).
- 15. However, Krzyzanowski does not teach the signature.
- 16. Tie, which is in the same field of endeavor, teaches the signature (paragraph 0029) for the purpose of ensuring the security of mobile terminal access and high confidentiality of communication (paragraph 0006). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Krzyzanowki with the signature of Tie to ensure the security of mobile terminal access and high confidentiality of communication.
- 17. Regarding claim 17, Krzyzanowski teaches the process action of the discovering device using the received network address to establish communications via the common network with the discoverable device that transmitted the address is performed only for a discoverable device of the type that it is desired for the discovering device to establish communications with (paragraph 0072; "mapping function ... maps legacy device bridges"), wherein the device type is ascertained from the signal transmitted by

Art Unit: 2619

the discoverable electronic device (paragraphs 0069, 0072; MAC address inherently indicates type because MAC addresses always contain a type field, e.g. organization (OUI) or multicast/unicast bit).

- 18. However, Krzyzanowski does not teach the signature.
- 19. Tie teaches the signature (paragraph 0029) for the purpose of ensuring the security of mobile terminal access and high confidentiality of communication (paragraph 0006). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Krzyzanowki with the signature of Tie to ensure the security of mobile terminal access and high confidentiality of communication.
- 20. Regarding claim 18, Krzyzanowski teaches the signal is in the form of an identifier that distinguishes the discoverable electronic device transmitting the signal from all other discoverable electronic devices in the delimited space (paragraph 0069).
- 21. However, Krzyzanowski does not teach the signature.
- 22. Tie teaches the signature (paragraph 0029) for the purpose of ensuring the security of mobile terminal access and high confidentiality of communication (paragraph 0006). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Krzyzanowki with the signature of Tie to ensure the security of mobile terminal access and high confidentiality of communication.
- 23. Regarding claim 22, Krzyzanowski does not teach the signal transmitted by a discoverable electronic device is encrypted, and wherein the process action of the

10/788,907 Art Unit: 2619

discovering device receiving a signal transmitted by a discoverable electronic device comprises an action of decrypting the signal.

- 24. Tie teaches the signal transmitted by a discoverable electronic device is encrypted (paragraphs 0029, 0037), and wherein the process action for receiving the signature signal transmitted by a discoverable electronic device comprises decrypting the signal (paragraph 0038) for the purpose of ensuring the security of mobile terminal access and high confidentiality of communication (paragraph 0006). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to, using the signals taught by Krzyzanowski, encrypt and decrypt them to ensure the security of mobile terminal access and high confidentiality of communication.
- 25. Claims 21 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krzyzanowski et al. (US 2004/0133704 A1, herein "Krzyzanowski") as applied to claim 15 above.
- 26. Regarding claim 21, Krzyzanowski does not teach repeating the transmission of the signal on a prescribed periodic basis. Examiner takes Official Notice that transmission of a discovery signal, either signature or request, on a periodic basis is well known in the art of network device discovery for the purpose of updating common network devices such as bridge devices, network controllers, switches, routers, etc. with the most recent network configuration for allocating resources and directing traffic. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to repeat the transmission of the signal of Krzyzanowski on a periodic basis to update the common network devices with the most recent network configuration.

10/788,907 Art Unit: 2619

- Regarding claim 30, Krzyzanowski teaches a computer-readable medium having 27. computer-executable instructions for facilitating the discovery of the network address of a discoverable electronic device by a discovering electronic device (paragraph 0037), wherein each device is connected to a common network and located in the same delimited space (paragraphs 0035, 0052, 0068), said computer-executable instructions comprising: transmitting a signal comprising data representing the address assigned to the discoverable device on the common network from the discoverable device to the discovering device (paragraphs 0069, 0072), wherein the signal is not transmitted via the common network and is transmitted in a manner that substantially limits its reception to the delimited space (paragraph 0072; "IR signal" is inherently limited to the delimited space because IR can not penetrate walls); and the discovering device using the received network address to establish communications via the common network between the discovering device and the discoverable device that transmitted the address (paragraph 0072; "mobile controller transmits the unique ID ... over an IP network").
- 28. However, Krzyzanowski does not teach repeating the transmission of the signal on a prescribed periodic basis. Examiner takes Official Notice that transmission of a discovery signal, either signature or request, on a periodic basis is well known in the art of network device discovery for the purpose of updating common network devices such as bridge devices, network controllers, switches, routers, etc. with the most recent network configuration for allocating resources and directing traffic. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to repeat

10/788,907 Art Unit: 2619

the transmission of the signal of Krzyzanowski on a periodic basis to update the common network devices with the most recent network configuration.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 29. Claims 1-14 and 24-29 are allowed.
- 30. Claim 23 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

31. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy Weidner whose telephone number is (571) 270-1825. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM, EST.

10/788,907

Art Unit: 2619

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TJW

CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Chan To Nfiger